

AO 440 (Rev. 12/09) Summons in a Civil Action

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Southern District of New York

ADRIAN SCHOOLCRAFT

Plaintiff

v.

CITY OF NEW YORK, ET AL.

Defendant

Civil Action No. 10CV06005

AmENDED SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

To: (Defendant's name and address) PLEASE SEE ATTACHED LIST FOR SERVICE NAMES AND ADDRESSES

A lawsuit has been filed against you.

Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney, whose name and address are:

JON L. NORINSBERG, PLLC
COHEN & FITCH, LLP
225 BROADWAY, SUITE 2700
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10007

If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court.

RUBY J. KRAJICK

CLERK OF COURT

Date: SEP 13 2010

Catherine Lapsley

Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

1. THE CITY OF NEW YORK
100 Church Street
New York, NY 10007
2. DEPUTY CHIEF MICHAEL MARINO, Tax Id. 873220
3. ASSISTANT CHIEF PATROL BOROUGH BROOKLYN NORTH GERALD NELSON, Tax Id. 912370
4. SERGEANT KURT DUNCAN, Shield No. 2483,
179 Wilson Avenue
Brooklyn, NY 11237
5. DEPUTY INSPECTOR STEVEN MAURIELLO, Tax Id. 895117
Transit Borough Bronx
460 Morris Park Avenue
Bronx, NY 10460
6. CAPTAIN THEODORE LAUTERBORN, Tax Id. 897840,
Narcotic Borough Brooklyn South/Narcotic Division
1 Police Plaza, Rm. 1100
New York, NY 10007
7. LIEUTENANT JOSEPH GOFF, Tax Id. 894025,
Emergency Service Unit
Floyd Bennettfield Edward Hall, 3rd Floor
Brooklyn, NY 11234
8. SGT. FREDERICK SAWYER, Shield No. 2576,
Special Unit
315 Hudson Street, 3rd Floor, Rm. 3
New York, NY 10013
9. LIEUTENANT CHRISTOPHER BROSCART, Tax Id. 915354
115th Precinct
92-15 Northern Blvd.,
Jackson Hgts., NY, 11372
10. LIEUTENANT TIMOTHY CAUGHEY, Tax Id. 885374
11. SERGEANT SHANTEL JAMES, Shield No. 30004
81st Precinct
30 Ralph Avenue
Brooklyn, NY, 11221
12. JAMAICA HOSPITAL MEDICAL CENTER
89 Van Wyck Expressway West
Jamaica, NY 11411
13. DR. ISAK ISAKOV
89 Van Wyck Expressway West
Jamaica, NY 11411
14. DR. LILIAN ALDANA-BERNIER
89 Van Wyck Expressway West
Jamaica, NY 11411

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK


ADRIAN SCHOOLCRAFT,

Plaintiff,

-against-

THE CITY OF NEW YORK, DEPUTY CHIEF MICHAEL MARINO, Tax Id. 873220, Individually and in his Official Capacity, ASSISTANT CHIEF PATROL BOROUGH BROOKLYN NORTH GERALD NELSON, Tax Id. 912370, Individually and in his Official Capacity, DEPUTY INSPECTOR STEVEN MAURIELLO, Tax Id. 895117, Individually and in his Official Capacity, CAPTAIN THEODORE LAUTERBORN, Tax Id. 897840, Individually and in his Official Capacity, LIEUTENANT JOSEPH GOFF, Tax Id. 894025, Individually and in his Official Capacity, SGT. FREDERICK SAWYER, Shield No. 2576, Individually and in his Official Capacity, SERGEANT KURT DUNCAN, Shield No. 2483, Individually and in his Official Capacity, LIEUTENANT CHRISTOPHER BROCHART, Tax Id. 915354, Individually and in his Official Capacity, LIEUTENANT TIMOTHY CAUGHEY, Tax Id. 885374, Individually and in his Official Capacity, SERGEANT SHANTEL JAMES, Shield No. 3004 and P.O.'s "JOHN DOE" #1-50, Individually and in their Official Capacity (the name John Doe being fictitious, as the true names are presently unknown) (collectively referred to as "NYPD defendants"), JAMAICA HOSPITAL MEDICAL CENTER, DR. ISAK ISAKOV, Individually and in his Official Capacity, DR. LILIAN ALDANA-BERNIER, Individually and in her Official Capacity and JAMAICA HOSPITAL MEDICAL CENTER EMPLOYEE'S "JOHN DOE" # 1-50, Individually and in their Official Capacity (the name John Doe being fictitious, as the true names are presently unknown),

Defendants.



AMENDED
COMPLAINT

10 CV 06005

JURY TRIAL
DEMANDED

ECF CASE

AC

Plaintiff ADRIAN SCHOOLCRAFT by his attorneys, Jon Norinsberg and Cohen & Fitch

LLP, complaining of the defendants, respectfully allege as follows:

GEORGE STANCU Accepted on behalf of
JAMAICA HOSPITAL MEDICAL CENTER on
9/16/10 AT 9:35 AM

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

1. Plaintiff brings this action for compensatory damages, punitive damages and attorney's fees pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and 42 U.S.C. § 1988 for violations of his civil rights, as said rights are secured by said statutes and the Constitutions of the State of New York and the United States.

2. This action seeks redress for a coordinated and concentrated effort by high ranking officials within the New York City Police Department (hereinafter "NYPD") to silence, intimidate, threaten and retaliate against plaintiff ADRIAN SCHOOLCRAFT, for his documentation and disclosure of corruption with the NYPD. Specifically, that the NYPD had established an illegal quota policy for the issuance of summonses and arrests and that defendants were falsifying and instructing police officers to suborn perjury on police reports in order to distort COMPSTAT statistics. In order to prevent disclosure of these illegal and unconstitutional acts, which would have revealed rampant NYPD corruption, defendants unlawfully entered plaintiff's home, had him forcibly removed in handcuffs, seized his personal effects, including evidence he had gathered documenting NYPD corruption and had him admitted to Jamaica Hospital Center against his will, under false and perjurious information that plaintiff was "emotionally disturbed". Thereafter defendant officers conspired with Jamaica Hospital Center personnel to have plaintiff involuntarily committed in its psychiatric ward for six (6) days, all in an effort to tarnish plaintiff's reputation and discredit his allegations should he succeed in disclosing evidence of widespread corruption within the NYPD.

JURISDICTION

3. This action is brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and 42 U.S.C. § 1988, and the Fourth, Fifth, and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution. Jurisdiction is

founded upon 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1343.

VENUE

4. Venue is properly laid in the Southern District of New York under U.S.C. § 1391(c), in that the defendant City of New York is a municipal corporation that resides in the Southern District of New York. Further, this matter is inextricably interwoven to a related proceeding currently pending in the Southern District of New York, Stinson et. al v. City of New York et. al, (RWS) 10 CV 4228.

JURY DEMAND

5. Plaintiff respectfully demands a trial by jury of all issues in this matter pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 38(b).

PARTIES

6. Plaintiff ADRIAN SCHOOLCRAFT is a Caucasian male, a citizen of the United States, and at all relevant times a resident of the City and State of New York.

7. Defendant CITY OF NEW YORK was and is a municipal corporation duly organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of New York.

8. Defendant CITY OF NEW YORK maintains the New York City Police Department, a duly authorized public authority and/or police department, authorized to perform all functions of a police department as per the applicable sections of the New York State Criminal Procedure Law, acting under the direction and supervision of the aforementioned municipal corporation, City of New York.

9. That at all times hereinafter mentioned, the individually named defendants DEPUTY CHIEF MICHAEL MARINO, ASSISTANT CHIEF PATROL BOROUGH BROOKLYN NORTH GERALD NELSON, DEPUTY INSPECTOR STEVEN MAURIELLO,

CAPTAIN THEODORE LAUTERBORN, LIEUTENANT TIMOTHY CAUGHEY, SERGEANT SHANTEL JAMES, LIEUTENANTANT JOSEPH GOFF, SERGEANT FREDERICK SAWYER, SERGEANT KURT DUNCAN, LIEUTENANT CHRISTOPHER BROSCART and P.O.'s "JOHN DOE" #1-50 were duly sworn police officers of said department and were acting under the supervision of said department and according to their official duties.

10. That at all times hereinafter mentioned the NYPD defendants, either personally or through their employees, were acting under color of state law and/or in compliance with the official rules, regulations, laws, statutes, customs, usages and/or practices of the State or City of New York.

11. Each and all of the acts of the NYPD defendants alleged herein were done by said defendants while acting within the scope of their employment by defendant THE CITY OF NEW YORK.

12. Each and all of the acts of the NYPD defendants alleged herein were done by said defendants while acting in furtherance of their employment by defendant THE CITY OF NEW YORK.

13. Defendant the JAMAICA HOSPITAL MEDICAL CENTER (hereinafter "JHMC") is a privately owned hospital located at 8900 Van Wyck Expressway, Jamaica, New York, 11418 and performs all functions of a hospital.

14. That at all times hereinafter mentioned the defendant, JHMC, was a domestic corporation duly organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of New York.

15. That at all times hereinafter mentioned, defendant JHMC owned, operated,

managed and controlled a certain hospital for the treatment of the sick and ailing in the County of Queens, State of New York, and as such held itself out as duly qualified to render proper and adequate hospital service for the treatment of the sick and ailing in the County of Queens, State of New York, and as such held itself out as duly qualified to render proper and adequate hospital, medical and surgical services to members of the general public, including plaintiff.

16. That at all times hereinafter mentioned, defendant DR. ISAK ISAKOV, was a physician duly licensed to practice medicine in the State of New York, and as such held himself out as duly qualified to render proper and adequate medical services to members of the general public, including plaintiff.

17. That at all times hereinafter mentioned, defendant DR. ISAK ISAKOV was the attending physician of the Psychiatric Department of JHMC, and was an employee, agent, servant and/or independent contractor retained by JHMC to render medical services, care and treatment patients seeking medical care at JHMC.

18. That at all times hereinafter mentioned, defendant DR. LILIAN ALDANA-BERNIER, was a physician duly licensed to practice medicine in the State of New York, and as such, held herself out as duly qualified to render proper and adequate medical services to members of the general public, including plaintiff.

19. That at all times hereinafter mentioned, defendant DR. LILIAN ALDANA-BERNIER was the admitting physician of the Psychiatric Department of JHMC, and was an employee, agent, servant and/or independent contractor retained by JHMC to render medical services, care and treatment patients seeking medical care at JHMC.

20. That at all times hereinafter mentioned, the defendants JHMC EMPLOYEE'S "JOHN DOE" # 1-50 were working for and were acting under the supervision of JHMC

according to their official duties.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff's Exemplary Career In the U.S. Navy and NYPD

21. Plaintiff ADRIAN SCHOOLCRAFT is a New York City Police Officer and has been employed by the New York City Police Department ("NYPD") since July, 2002.

22. Prior to the events set forth below, plaintiff ADRIAN SCHOOLCRAFT was a decorated New York City police officer and United States Navy veteran.

23. From 1993 to 1997, plaintiff ADRIAN SCHOOLCRAFT served honorably in the United States Navy.

24. During this time, plaintiff ADRIAN SCHOOLCRAFT received several commendations, including the "National Defense Service Medal" and the "First Good Conduct Medal."

25. After four years of distinguished service on the USS Blue Ridge, plaintiff ADRIAN SCHOOLCRAFT received an honorable discharge from the United States Navy on July 22, 1997.

26. Thereafter, plaintiff ADRIAN SCHOOLCRAFT, whose father was a police officer, decided to join the New York City Police Department in July 2002.

27. Fourteen months after joining the NYPD, plaintiff began working at the 81st Precinct, where he remained until October 31, 2009.

28. In total, plaintiff ADRIAN SCHOOLCRAFT worked for six years at the 81st Precinct.

29. During this time, plaintiff ADRIAN SCHOOLCRAFT became the senior patrol officer on the 4:00 p.m. to 12:00 p.m. at the 81st Precinct.

30. In this capacity, plaintiff ADRIAN SCHOOLCRAFT was often sought out by other police officers for his knowledge, experience and sound judgment in handling difficult work situations.

31. In his seven year career with the NYPD, plaintiff ADRIAN SCHOOLCRAFT had an exemplary record and in fact received multiple commendations for his work as a police officer.

32. For example, On October 28, 2006, plaintiff received a "Meritorious Police Duty Medal" for his "outstanding performance" as a police officer.

33. Similarly, on June 4, 2008, plaintiff received an award from the NYPD for his "dedication to the New York City Police Department and to the City of New York."

Plaintiff Witnesses Enforcement of an Illegal Quota Policy for Summonses and Arrests

34. During his time at the 81st precinct, plaintiff began to observe a pattern and practice of supervisors enforcing a *de facto* quota policy requiring police officers to issue a certain number summons and arrests per month.

35. Additionally, plaintiff observed that personal performance evaluations were almost entirely based on adherence to this quota and officers failing to meet the required amount were subject to work related consequences, such as loss of overtime, tour changes and denial of vacation days.

36. Further, in October 2006, directly coinciding with defendant DEPUTY INSPECTOR STEVEN MAURIELLO's assignment to the 81st precinct, plaintiff and his fellow police officers started to receive explicit threats of tour transfers, undesirable assignments, poor performance evaluations and other adverse consequences for failure to meet their monthly arrest and summons quotas.

37. These admonishments to adhere to monthly quotas were repeatedly emphasized by the defendant officers at the daily roll calls in the 81st precinct throughout plaintiff's employment.

38. For example, on December 8, 2008, Defendant MAURIELLO berated his officers for not writing enough summonses per month: "I SEE EIGHT FUCKING SUMMONSES FOR A 20 DAY PERIOD OR A MONTH. IF YOU MESS UP, HOW THE HELL DO YOU WANT ME TO DO THE RIGHT THING BY YOU?"

39. Defendant MAURIELLO repeatedly drove home this message, explicitly threatening to move officers out of their platoons if they did not make their numbers. For example, on October 28, 2008, MAURIELLO shouted out to his officers: "IF YOU DON'T WORK, AND I GET THE SAME NAMES BACK AGAIN, *I'M MOVING YOU. YOU'RE GOING TO GO TO ANOTHER PLATOON!*"

40. Defendants' illegal quota policy was enforced not just by Mauriello, but by other high-ranking members of the 81st Precinct. For example, on January 28, 2009, Sergeant Raymond Stukes stated: "I TOLD YOU GUYS LAST MONTH: THEY ARE LOOKING AT THESE NUMBERS, AND PEOPLE ARE GOING TO GET MOVED ... THEY CAN MAKE YOUR JOB REAL UNCOMFORTABLE, AND WE ALL KNOW WHAT THAT MEANS."

41. On December 8, 2008, another Sergeant made similar threats: "WHEN I TELL YOU TO GET YOUR ACTIVITY UP, ITS FOR A REASON, BECAUSE THEY ARE LOOKING TO MOVE PEOPLE, AND HE'S SERIOUS THERE'S PEOPLE IN HERE THAT MAY NOT BE HERE NEXT MONTH."

42. Additionally, on October 18, 2009 another Sergeant made it explicitly clear to the subordinate officers that "AGAIN, IT'S ALL ABOUT THE NUMBERS."

Officers Were Being Instructed to Make Arrests and Issue Summonses Without Probable Cause

43. In fact, defendants were so obsessed with making their “numbers” that they literally instructed officers to make arrests when there was *no* evidence of any criminal activity whatsoever.

44. For example, on October 31, 2008, Mauriello ordered his officers to arrest virtually *everybody* they came in contact with at 120 Chauncey Street in Brooklyn, with or without probable cause: “EVERYBODY GOES. I DON’T CARE. YOU’RE ON 120 CHAUNCEY AND THEY’RE POPPING CHAMPAGNE? YOKE E’M. PUT THEM THROUGH THE SYSTEM. THEY GOT BANDANNAS ON, ARREST THEM. EVERYBODY GOES TONIGHT. THEY’RE UNDERAGE? FUCK IT.”

45. Similar orders were given by a Sergeant on November 23, 2008. “IF THEY’RE ON A CORNER, MAKE ‘EM MOVE. IF THEY DON’T WANT TO MOVE, LOCK ‘EM UP. DONE DEAL. YOU CAN ALWAYS ARTICULATE [A CHARGE] LATER.”

46. Thus, police officers at the 81st Precinct were being instructed to arrest and summons fully innocent people for crimes that never occurred for nothing more than standing on a street corner in their neighborhoods and then “articulate” or create a charge later.

NYPD Policy Making Officials Were the Driving Force Behind This Quota and Policy

47. Defendants’ myopic obsession with quotas came straight from the highest ranking officials in the New York City Police Department.

48. For example, Chief of Transportation MICHAEL SCAGNELLI, a three star Chief, was quoted as saying: “HOW MANY SUPERSTARS AND HOW MANY LOSERS DO WE HAVE, HOW MANY SUMMONSES DOES THE SQUAD WRITE. WE NEED MORE ACTIVITY, IF YOUR PRODUCTIVITY FALLS BELOW PAR EITHER YOU OR THE C.O.

IS GOING TO HAVE TO ANSWER.”

49. Another high-ranking official at the 81st Precinct, Lieutenant Delafuente, actually gave specific numbers that must be met by each officer: “[CAPTAIN STARKY] WANTS AT LEAST 3 SEATBELTS (SUMMONSES), 1 CELL PHONE (SUMMONS) AND 11 OTHERS (SUMMONSES).”

Plaintiff Refuses to Comply with the NYPD’s Unlawful Quota Policy, Leading to Increased Pressure and Scrutiny from His Supervisors

50. Unlike many of his colleagues, plaintiff ADRIAN SCHOOLCRAFT refused to issue or to be coerced to issue unwarranted and illegal summonses and arrest innocent people in the absence of probable cause simply to meet a quota.

51. As a direct result of this “non-compliance,” in January 2009, plaintiff ADRIAN SCHOOLCRAFT began to be scrutinized and increasingly pressured by his supervisors and commanding officer’s to increase his “ACTIVITY” (i.e. not writing enough summons and making arrests), or face possible low performance evaluations and tour/command reassignment.

52. Specifically, on January 13, 2009, plaintiff was summoned to a meeting with LT. RAFAEL MASCOL, who commanded him to increase his “OVERALL ACTIVITY,” or he would be placed on “PERFORMANCE MONITORING” and be subject to “LOW QUARTERLY EVALUATIONS.”

53. Further, when plaintiff requested an explanation of the lieutenant’s definition of “ACTIVITY,” MASCOL explicitly referenced the need to increase his issuance of summonses and arrests.

Plaintiff Receives a Poor Evaluation Based On His Low Summons “Activity”

54. On January 29, 2009, plaintiff did, in fact, receive a poor performance evaluation as a result of his failure to issue the mandated number of summons and arrests required by his

supervisors and Borough chief.

55. Specifically, plaintiff received an overall rating of 2.5 out of 5.0, despite the fact that the average of his scores based on the number of categories contained in the evaluation should have been markedly higher than 2.5.

56. For example, plaintiff's average for "performance areas" was actually 3.75, and contained no rating which was less than 3.0. Similarly, plaintiff's average for "behavior dimensions" was 3.25, still well above the 2.5 rating that he received.

57. In addition, the balance of the evaluation contained the following praise for plaintiff:

P.O. Schoolcraft shows good community interaction by eliciting information from witnesses and victims. He also mediates problems between disputing individuals and provides counseling when families have conflicts. P.O. Schoolcraft is able to complete arrest forms accurately and completely [and] is able to fingerprint, photograph and process all arrest related paperwork.

58. Thus, it is clear that plaintiff's failure to meet the NYPD summons/arrests quota – which plaintiff's supervisors termed "poor activity" and attributed to plaintiff's "unwilling[ness] to change his approach to meeting performance standards" – was the *real* reason why plaintiff received such a poor performance evaluation.

Plaintiff Challenges His Low Work Evaluation, Resulting in Intense Scrutiny By His Supervisors

59. Thereafter, plaintiff immediately informed his supervisors of his intention to appeal his evaluation based on the fact that they had either miscalculated their overall rating or he had been evaluated on an illegal and unconstitutional basis (i.e. not meeting arrest/summons quota).

60. On February 1, 2009, following plaintiff's disclosure of his intention to appeal, a

poster that read "IF YOU DON'T LIKE YOUR JOB THEN MAYBE YOU SHOULD GET ANOTHER JOB" was posted to plaintiff's locker.

61. On February 3, 2009, Sgt. Meyer, the Squad Sergeant at the 81st Precinct, directly pressured plaintiff to increase his summons activity: "WHY DON'T YOU JUST CONFORM? THEY WANT A BOOK (20 SUMMONSES), SO EVERYONE WRITES 15 (SUMMONSES). YOU COULD GET AWAY WITH 10 OR 12 (SUMMONSES) AND A COLLAR (ARREST)."

62. Following that incident, on February 20, 2009 plaintiff ADRIAN SCHOOLCRAFT was approached by defendant MASCOL who informed plaintiff that the only way plaintiff improve future performance evaluations, was if plaintiff raised his "ACTIVITY," by writing "MORE SUMMONSES" and being "MORE PROACTIVE."

63. In response to this ultimatum, plaintiff ADRIAN SCHOOLCRAFT informed defendant MASCOL that he would try to improve his activity but that he would not write illegal summonses or arrest people in the absence of probable cause to believe that a summonsable or arrestable offense had been committed.

Defendants Attempt To "Strong-Arm" Plaintiff Into Dropping His Appeal

64. Thereafter, on February 25, 2009, plaintiff ADRIAN SCHOOLCRAFT was commanded to a meeting with all of the supervisors at the 81st Precinct to discuss the appeal of his evaluation.

65. The meeting was attended by, amongst others DEPUTY INSPECTOR STEVEN MAURIELLO, SERGEANT WEISS, LIEUTENANT DELAFUENTE, CAPTAIN THEODORE LAUTERBORN, LIEUTENANT RAFAEL MASCOL, LIEUTENANT TIMOTHY CAUGHEY, and SERGEANT RAYMOND STUKES.

66. During this meeting, the aforementioned supervisors repeatedly attempted to

discourage plaintiff from appealing his performance evaluation and implicitly threatened plaintiff with retaliation if he pursued the issue.

67. Specifically, in an aggressive, threatening tone, the supervising officers expressed their “concern” that the appeal would be reviewed by DEPUTY CHIEF MICHAEL MARINO and “HE’S GOING TO LOOK AT YOUR EVALUATION, HE MAY PULL UP ALL YOUR ACTIVITY AND THEN HE’S GOING TO SAY YOU WANT TO KNOW WHAT YOUR EVALUATION IS? LOOK AT THE ACTIVITY, WHAT ARE YOU FUCKING KIDDING ME?! KNOWING HIM, HE’S GOING TO TALK A LOT OF SHIT.”

68. In fact, the sole purpose of the meeting was that plaintiff had an insufficient number of summonses and arrests and as such his evaluation was warranted.

69. The commanding officers at this meeting repeatedly informed plaintiff that he could get a higher evaluation if he would raise his activity, but when plaintiff repeatedly requested an explanation as to the definition of “activity” he was repeatedly informed he needed to write more summonses and arrests.

70. Specifically, plaintiff was informed in sum and substance “HOW ARE WE GOING TO JUDGE SOMEBODY THAT HAS TEN COLLARS THROUGH THE YEAR AND MAYBE 25 SUMMONSES THROUGH THE YEAR, COMPARED TO SOMEONE WHO’S GOT 4 COLLARS WITH 14 SUMMONSES THROUGH THE YEAR? THERE’S GOT TO BE SOME VARIATION. THE SQUAD SERGEANT MAKES A DETERMINATION WHO IS TOP GUYS ARE, COMPARED TO HIS LOWER GUYS. THAT’S HOW ITS DONE.”

71. Then, in a blatantly transparent act of intimidation, supervisors then referenced police officers who had previously been terminated or transferred as a result of vocalizing objections to their evaluations.

72. This meeting was an overt attempt to silence plaintiff's appeal because of the supervisor's prior knowledge of the illegality of issuing substandard performance evaluations -- based on an officer's failure to meet a summons quota, which had been firmly established by the Labor Arbitration Tribunal more than three years earlier.

The NYPD's Quota Policy: Struck Down As Illegal in January 2006

73. In fact, the NYPD had previously been found to be in violation of New York State Labor Law Section 215-a, which makes it illegal to issue poor evaluations for an officer's failure to meet the requirement of for an established summons quota. See In the Matter of P.B.A. and City of New York Case # A-10699-04.

74. The aforementioned decision was based on Police Officer David Velez's appeal of his 2005 performance evaluation from the 75th precinct, which was based entirely on his failure to meet the minimum summons quota. (Id.)

75. In that matter, P.O. Velez presented evidence that the then Commanding Officer of the 75th precinct, CHIEF MICHAEL MARINO, a named defendant in the instant matter, issued a directive that officers must meet "a quota of 10 (ten) summons per month" and "that the police officers in squad A-1 received lower marks on their evaluations if the officers did not meet 'this minimum requirement.'" (Id. at 9).

76. Additionally, CHIEF MICHAEL MARINO reduced this directive to writing and distributed it to all of the supervisors in the 75th Precinct. (Id.)

77. The aforementioned written directive ordered that supervising officers were required to evaluate officers based on their adherence to the minimum quota of summonses and arrests. Id.

78. As a result of CHIEF MARINO's directive, Sgt. Lurch issued a memo to all

officers in the 75th precinct “remind[ing] [officers] that a FAILURE TO WRITE THE REQUIRED AMOUNT OF SUMMONSES AND FAILURE TO MAKE THE REQUIRED NUMBER OF ARREST FOR EACH RATING PERIOD WILL RESULT IN SUBSTANDARD PERFORMANCE RATINGS.” (*Id.* at 10).

79. The aforementioned memo was entitled “Squad Activity Expectations,” and the word “activity” in that memo was specifically referring to the requisite number of summonses needed to meet the quota, which is unequivocal evidence of the fact that P.O. SCHOOLCRAFT’s own low evaluation in the present matter based on his “poor *activity*” directly correlates to a failure to meet an illegal summons/arrest quota.

80. While defendants denied the existence of any quota, the arbitrator emphatically rejected defendants’ claims:

The Arbitrator finds that C.O. Marino’s writing and Sergeant Lurch’s memo *could not have been clearer*: “failure to write the required amount of summonses ... will result in substandard performance ratings ...” Further, the asterisk in the goal column makes it clear that [these] “goals” are monthly, quarterly and yearly. The Arbitrator is *completely persuaded* that the “goals” column on this memo meets the definition in Labor Law Section 215-a for “quota” ... [Thus], the New York Police Department violated New York State Labor Law Section 215-a by establishing and maintaining a summons quota ... (*Id.* at 11, 27) (emphasis added).

81. Notwithstanding this finding, the chief perpetrator of this unlawful policy, MICHAEL MARINO, was subsequently promoted by the NYPD and is now the Deputy Chief of Patrol Borough Brooklyn North, in charge of supervising the entire Borough, which is also where the 81st precinct is located.

82. Given the existence of the aforementioned related appeal and subsequent decision, it is clear that February 25, 2009 “meeting” was an obvious effort to prevent plaintiff’s

appeal, to avoid the repercussions to defendants which could follow if they were found to have violated the previous order, and engaged in this illegal quota practice once again.

83. Furthermore, this “meeting” was an attempt to prevent plaintiff from exposing the NYPD’s pattern and practice of falsifying training logs during roll calls, in which commanding officers would require patrol officers to sign a log indicating that they had received training that day on various police subjects, when in fact, they had received no such training from their supervisors.

Plaintiff Refuses to Drop His Appeal and Instead Directly Challenges the NYPD’s Unlawful Quota Policy

84. It is clear that February 25, 2009 “meeting” was an obvious effort to prevent plaintiff’s appeal to avoid the repercussions to defendants which could follow.

85. Notwithstanding their implicit threats and veiled tactics of intimidation, plaintiff informed the group that he would pursue the appeal.

86. Thereafter, on March 11, 2009, plaintiff’s counsel, Brown & Gropper, wrote a letter to defendant MAURIELLO which directly challenged the NYPD’s unlawful quota policy and the use of this policy as a basis for plaintiff’s performance evaluation. Specifically, in this letter, plaintiff’s counsel wrote as follows:

We are concerned that our client’s negative evaluation is based *not* on the factors set forth in Patrol Guide 205-48, but rather on his alleged *lack of “activity” related to his number of arrests and summons issued*. Yet, Patrol Guide 205-48 makes no reference to “activity” levels. Furthermore, we are unaware of any Patrol Guide provision which defines how much “activity” is required to achieve a satisfactory evaluation.

Plaintiff’s Refusal to Drop His Appeal Results in Increased Harassment and Intimidation by His Superior Officers

87. As a result of plaintiff’s intention to pursue his appeal, plaintiff’s supervisors at

the 81st Precinct began to create an increasingly hostile work environment for him.

88. Specifically, on March 16, 2009, defendant CAUGHEY issued plaintiff a written reprimand for not documenting in his memo book that he had used the bathroom facility on his assigned post.

89. Defendant CAUGHEY also confiscated plaintiff's memo book and made a photocopy of plaintiff's official notes, which documented defendants' previous misconduct, and more specifically, that of SGT. WEISS.

90. That same day plaintiff reported the incident to the duty Captain, defendant LAUTERBORN.

91. Plaintiff requested that defendant LAUTERBORN document this act of retaliation against him in a report.

92. Defendant LAUTERBORN responded to this request in sum and substance: "WHAT DO YOU WANT TO REPORT? DIDN'T WE TELL YOU WHEN YOU LEFT HERE THAT THERE'S GONNA BE A LOT MORE SUPERVISION? THAT'S WHAT HAPPENS... YOU THINK THAT THIS IS... YOU KNOW... RETALIATION... THIS IS A MATTER OF SUPERVISION."

93. Defendant LAUTERBORN further warned plaintiff that, after the threat of a transfer, "THE DEVIL YOU KNOW IS MUCH BETTER THAN THE DEVIL YOU DON'T," and that from this point onward, plaintiff better "CROSS YOUR I(S) AND DOT YOUR T(S)."

94. During this conversation, defendant LAUTERBORN informed plaintiff that he was being carefully monitored because of his "POOR PERFORMANCE" and suggested that it should not be a surprise now if even minor infractions result in disciplinary action, even if they had not previously resulted in such action.

95. Defendant LAUTERBORN further informed plaintiff that he was being placed on "PERFORMANCE MONITORING" because his "NUMBERS" were not sufficient and that defendant MAURIELLO was a "FANATIC" about ensuring officers have high "ACTIVITY," implicitly threatening to transfer plaintiff should he not increase his "ACTIVITY."

96. As he had previously informed defendant MASCOL, plaintiff reiterated to defendant LAUTERBORN that he would work to improve his "ACTIVITY" but refused to issue illegal summonses or make false arrests absent probable cause of a crime or violation, to which defendant LAUTERBORN responded by openly mocking plaintiff: "YOU WANT TO BE 'MR. COMMUNITY', IS THAT WHAT YOUR DOING?!"

97. Defendant LAUTERBORN proceeded to provide plaintiff with examples of situations where plaintiff could make arrests or issue summonses to increase his activity despite, the fact that there had been "NO VIOLATION OF LAW."

98. Specifically, defendant LAUTERBORN instructed plaintiff to approach and detain young adults merely for sitting in front of a high crime building, regardless of probable cause or reasonable suspicion.

99. Further defendant LAUTERBORN then suggested that were he to hear one of those individuals curse during this interaction, it would then be appropriate to arrest them despite having committed "NO VIOLATION OF LAW," because the police can not appear "SOFT" in these neighborhoods.

Defendants Attempt to Isolate and Separate Plaintiff from His Fellow Officers

100. In a further effort to intimidate plaintiff, in March of 2009 defendants also began to isolate plaintiff ADRIAN SCHOOLCRAFT from his fellow officers by threatening and actually disciplining Police Officer Chan, for simply talking to plaintiff.

101. As a result fellow police officers at the 81st precinct consistently avoided plaintiff out of fear that supervisors would retaliate against them.

Defendants Escalate Their Intimidation Tactics by Taking Away Plaintiff's Gun and Shield

102. Thereafter, plaintiff learned from P.O. ZUCKER of the 81st Precinct that defendants were attempting to execute a scenario portraying plaintiff as being psychologically unfit to work, in which plaintiff would be involuntarily committed to a hospital.

103. Specifically, on March 16, 2009, defendant WEISS was overheard stating, in reference to plaintiff: "I'M GOING TO HAVE HIM PSYCHED."

104. In April of 2009, defendants saw an opportunity to pursue this scheme when plaintiff had a legitimate health issue.

105. In furtherance of this plan, plaintiff was required to consult NYPD psychologist ~~Dr. Catherine Lamstein for a psychological evaluation following an unrelated examination by~~ NYPD police surgeon, Joseph Cuffio, M.D., for chest pains he experienced on April 3, 2009.

106. During his examination with Dr. Lamstein, plaintiff disclosed the existence of illegal NYPD policies and practices and other corruption he had observed over the past year.

107. At the conclusion of Dr. Lamstein's examination, and immediately following plaintiff's disclosure of rampant corruption within the 81st Precinct, Dr. Lamstein abruptly excused herself from the room for several minutes and suddenly returned only to inform plaintiff that he was required to immediately surrender his gun and shield.

Plaintiff's Appeal Is Suddenly Closed Without His Knowledge or Consent

108. On April 14, 2009, the following day, plaintiff's performance evaluation appeal was "coincidentally" and inexplicably closed, without a hearing or notice of any kind as to the basis of the closure.

109. It should be noted that while the appeal was closed in fact on April 14, 2009, plaintiff was not made aware of this fact until a much later date.

110. Despite being denied any information regarding his appeal, plaintiff continued to relentlessly inquire about the appeal process, when and if a hearing would ever be scheduled or held, to which NYPD officials repeatedly refused to disclose any information, and feigned ignorance.

111. Additionally, plaintiff repeatedly sent letters to the Patrolman's Benevolent Association (hereinafter "PBA") and their lawyers, in furtherance of pressing his appeal, to which they repeatedly informed him that they could not help.

Defendants Attempt To Further Isolate and Degrade Plaintiff by Assigning Him to the Telephone Switchboard

112. Thereafter, throughout the summer of 2009, plaintiff continued to be systematically isolated from the remainder of the precinct in the form of reassignment to telephone switchboard duty.

113. While there plaintiff was subjected to overt attempts of intimidation and harassment in the form of fellow police officers and supervising officers referring to him as a "ZERO" and/or the "HOUSE MOUSE."

114. Additionally, throughout his reassignment, plaintiff witnessed further evidence of continued corruption and subornation of perjury on numerous occasions in the form of officers, commanding and subordinate, falsifying information contained in complainant crime reports (UF-61's) and/or failing to issue them altogether in the face of reported crime.

115. During the same period, despite having his gun and shield removed due to his alleged psychological instability and/or concerns for his and his fellow officers' safety, plaintiff was assigned to voucher loaded weapons and was assigned to handle arrests.

Plaintiff Reports the Corruption He Has Witnessed To Internal Affairs

116. On August 18, 2009, in response to this campaign of retaliation and intimidation, plaintiff's father, Larry Schoolcraft, contacted David Durk, a former NYPD Detective who had assisted Frank Serpico in the 1970s in uncovering corruption within the NYPD to seek his counsel regarding the proper actions to be taken.

117. Following that conversation, David Durk contacted Brandon Del Pozo at the Internal Affairs Bureau ("IAB") to apprise him of the corruption within the 81st precinct.

118. Thereafter, on August 20, 2009 plaintiff contacted IAB directly, by filing an Unusual Incident Report (UF-49), alleging that defendant CAUGHEY -- ironically the *Integrity Control Officer* for the 81st precinct -- had unlawfully entered a locked office at the precinct and removed potentially damaging documents from SGT. WEISS' personnel file, all at the behest of SGT. WEISS.

119. Specifically, in this report, entitled "CORRUPTION INVOLVING THE INTEGRITY CONTROL PROGRAM OF THE 81ST PRECINCT", plaintiff alleged as follows:

Sergeant Steven Weiss (Assistant Integrity Control Officer, 81st Precinct), assisted by his supervisor, a Lieutenant Timothy Caughey (Integrity Control Officer, 81st Precinct"), did intentionally enter, without permission or authority, a locked office containing sensitive department files, and removed documents pertaining to Civilian Complaints that were inside Sgt. Weiss's Department Personnel Folder ... [These] documents were a potential obstacle with regards to Sgt. Weiss' future Evaluation and Promotion to New York City Police Lieutenant. Sgt. Weiss has since been promoted to New York City Police Lieutenant and is no longer assigned to the 81st Precinct...It would appear [that] Sgt. Weiss has benefitted greatly from his action(s).

120. This complaint was sent directly to Chief Charles V. Campisi, Chief of the Internal Affairs Bureau, via certified mail on August 20, 2009.

Plaintiff's Superiors Become Aware of Plaintiff's Complaints to Internal Affairs

121. Almost immediately after informing IAB of these illegal practices and widespread corruption at the 81st Precinct, IAB detectives repeatedly left messages for plaintiff at the 81st Precinct, despite the explicit duty of IAB to keep such complaints confidential, effectively and implicitly alerting plaintiff's superiors that he was now actively working with IAB on investigations, criminal in nature, concerning the 81st Precinct.

122. On September 2, 2009, plaintiff sent a written request to defendant STEVEN MAURIELLO requesting in writing that the appeal of his evaluation be sent directly to the Patrol Borough Brooklyn North immediately.

123. Not only did defendant STEVEN MAURIELLO fail to issue any response to this request, but he had never even previously sent the appeal -- as he was *mandated* to -- nor did he ever inform plaintiff that his appeal had been closed in April, despite plaintiff's repeated inquiries.

Plaintiff Reveals Rampant Illegal Conduct At the 81st Precinct to the Quality Assurance Division of the NYPD

124. Thereafter, on October 7, 2009, during the course of a three hour meeting with the Quality Assurance Division ("QAD"), plaintiff described in detail repeated instances of police misconduct he had witnessed in the 81st Precinct, including but not limited to, commanding and supervising officers' manipulation of crime statistics and enforcement of illegal quota policies.

125. On October 14, 2009, one week following the aforesaid meeting with QAD, plaintiff was officially placed on performance monitoring by the employee management division of the NYPD.

126. On October 19, 2009, in an increasingly desperate attempt to suppress plaintiff's disclosure of the corruption and deceptive practices plaguing the 81st Precinct, defendant

CAUGHEY issued a precinct-wide personnel memo to all personnel of the 81st Precinct ordering any and all calls from IAB be first directed to his office, regardless of the specific officer IAB was attempting to contact.

127. On October 21, 2009, plaintiff was interviewed by telephone by members of the "Group I" Internal Affairs Bureau regarding his allegations of misconduct against defendants CAUGHEY and WEISS.

128. On October 21, 2009, with deliberate indifference to plaintiff's safety and welfare, IAB attempted to contact plaintiff to discuss the substance of the UF-49 he had filed against defendant CAUGHEY on August 20, 2009, a call which was routed first to defendant CAUGHEY who was also the subject of the complaint.

Plaintiff Continues to Pursue His Appeal But To No Avail

129. Thereafter on October 28, 2009, still unaware that his appeal had been closed, plaintiff contacted SGT DEVINO to arrange a meeting regarding the status of his appeal.

130. At this meeting SGT DEVINO informed plaintiff that she was ignorant to the status of plaintiff's appeal and feigned sentiments of surprise and disbelief that the process was still ongoing.

131. Thereafter, plaintiff's father, Larry Schoolcraft, contacted Mayor Bloomberg's office to report the repeated and continuing instances of corruption within the 81st Precinct, to which plaintiff had bore witness, and to inquire as to the reason plaintiff was being deprived the right to appeal his performance evaluation.

On October 31, 2009 Plaintiff is Menaced at Work by Lt. Caughey, Whom Plaintiff Had Previously Reported to Internal Affairs

132. Thereafter, on October 31, 2009, upon commencement of his tour of duty, defendant CAUGHEY confronted plaintiff and immediately ordered plaintiff to surrender his

memo book.

133. Upon confiscation of his memobook, defendant CAUGHEY proceeded to lock himself in a room for three hours in order to make copies of plaintiff's notes contained therein, which at this point now included specific instances of the corruption and illegal activity plaintiff had documented in preparation for his report to Commissioner Kelly.

134. Following defendant CAUGHEY's confiscation of plaintiff's memobook, defendant CAUGHEY began to exhibit menacing and threatening behavior towards plaintiff.

135. Specifically, defendant CAUGHEY with one hand near his gun, made continuous menacing gestures directed at plaintiff in an apparent response to the evidence of corruption contained within plaintiff's memobook implicating defendants.

Plaintiff Leaves Work One Hour Early After Receiving Permission To Do So From Sgt. Huffman

136. Thereafter, at approximately 2:30 p.m. on October 31, 2008, Plaintiff was advised by civilian employee P.A.A. Boston, who had become aware of defendant CAUGHEY's increasingly threatening behavior, that plaintiff's safety may be in jeopardy.

137. As a result of this admonishment and plaintiff's independent observations, plaintiff's fear consequently manifested itself in feelings of sickness, at which time plaintiff elected to go home rather than subject himself to potential physical harm from defendant CAUGHEY.

138. At approximately 2:45 p.m. on October 31, 2009, less than one hour before his tour was scheduled to end, plaintiff sought permission to take sick leave, which he submitted to SERGEANT RASHEENA HUFFMAN.

139. In response to plaintiff's request, SERGEANT HUFFMAN approved plaintiff's release, but following plaintiff's departure, HUFFMAN subsequently and without reason

rescinded her approval via voicemail to plaintiff's cell phone, ordering him back to the precinct immediately.

140. Immediately upon plaintiff's arrival at his home, plaintiff contacted IAB to report defendant CAUGHEY's threatening behavior.

141. Thereafter, plaintiff, fearful of the impending retaliatory acts to follow, contacted his father, Larry Schoolcraft, to report and document what had just transpired, after which plaintiff attempted to sleep in an effort to alleviate his feelings of illness.

142. While asleep, plaintiff received a voicemail message on his phone from Dr. Lamstein -- who had last seen plaintiff on October 27, 2009, and who knew first-hand that plaintiff had no psychiatric disorders whatsoever -- who was clearly bewildered as to why defendants required plaintiff to return to command, despite her repeated advisements to plaintiff's supervisors that in her medical and professional opinion, plaintiff posed no threat to himself or others. Dr. Lamstein nevertheless admonished plaintiff, presumably at defendants' direction, that if he did not return immediately, this would "[BLOW] UP TO A MUCH BIGGER MESS THAN [PLAINTIFF] WOULD WANT."

The NYPD Threatens a "City-Wide Search" For Plaintiff If He Does Not Return To Work

143. Additionally, on about or in between the aforesaid correspondence, defendant LAUTERBORN contacted Larry Schoolcraft inquiring as to plaintiff's whereabouts.

144. In response, at approximately 7:40 p.m. on October 31, 2009, Larry Schoolcraft returned the call and explained to defendant LAUTERBORN that he had communicated with his son who had informed him that he was at home, feeling sick and wanted to rest, to which defendant LAUTERBORN responded in sum and substance "[SHOULD PLAINTIFF NOT RETURN TO COMMAND], THIS IS GOING TO GET TO BE A LARGE SCALE

EVENT...WHEN THE BELLS AND WHISTLES GO OFF ITS GOING TO BE A CITY WIDE SEARCH FOR ADRIAN SCHOOLCRAFT.”

145. Following that statement, Larry Schoolcraft inquired as to the urgency of Adrian’s return to the command that same day, to which defendant LAUTERBORN gave no legitimate explanation and instead, in an increasingly threatening manner, advised plaintiff’s father that things were going to escalate should plaintiff not return immediately.

Defendants Unlawfully Enter Plaintiff’s Home and Illegally Seize Him in Order to Prevent Him From Disclosing to the Public His Findings of Corruption

146. Thereafter, on October 31, 2009 at approximately 9:38 p.m., plaintiff, who was lawfully present inside of his home located at 8260 88th Place, Apt. 2L, Glendale, NY 11385, was confronted with approximately ten (10) armed high ranking police officers, including but not limited to, CHIEF MICHAEL MARINO, PAUL BROWN, and STEVEN MAURIELLO, who unlawfully entered his home without a warrant, permission, or other legally permissible reason to do so.

147. In addition, at least two members of the Emergency Services Unit – dressed in full riot gear with helmets and tasers – also illegally entered plaintiff’s apartment.

148. Upon defendants’ unlawful entry into plaintiff’s home, the aforementioned defendants ordered plaintiff to get dressed and commanded him to return to the 81st Precinct without any legitimate or lawful explanation.

149. In a remarkable display of calmness under the circumstances, plaintiff repeatedly and composedly requested the reasons why defendants were unlawfully in his home commanding him back to work against his will, to which defendants pretextually responded that they were “worried” and “concerned” for plaintiff’s safety and wellbeing despite plaintiff’s repeated assurances that he was merely feeling sick and not in any way a danger to himself or

others and despite the fact that plaintiff's own NYPD appointed psychologist had previously informed defendants that same day that any such fears were medically unfounded.

150. Immediately thereafter, plaintiff was informed that he was under suspension for leaving work early that day.

151. Further, plaintiff expressly acknowledged that were there work related consequences for his departure, defendants should simply follow the normal protocol and file the proper paperwork to which plaintiff would respond accordingly.

Defendants Threaten To Treat Plaintiff as an "Emotionally Disturbed Person" If He Does Not Leave His Apartment "Voluntarily"

152. Despite plaintiff's overwhelmingly reasonable response, which was in total and utter compliance with NYPD protocol and practice, defendants responded with a continued refusal to leave plaintiff's home, subsequently ordering him while armed, to the hospital illegally and against his will, to which plaintiff responded by repeatedly asserting his rights under New York law to refuse unwanted medical treatment.

153. In retaliation to plaintiff's assertion of his rights, and with the knowledge that plaintiff potentially possessed evidence of defendants' criminal activity and corruption, defendant MICHAEL MARINO responded with the following ultimatum: "YOU HAVE A CHOICE. YOU GET UP LIKE A MAN AND PUT YOUR SHOES ON AND WALK INTO THAT BUS [ambulance], OR THEY'RE GOING TO TREAT YOU AS AN E.D.P. [emotionally disturbed person] AND THAT MEANS HANDCUFFS."

154. Immediately thereafter, a series of verbal exchanges occurred between plaintiff and defendant CHIEF MARINO, in which plaintiff calmly and repeatedly expressed to defendants that he was refusing any more medical attention and refused to be involuntarily removed from his home.

155. Aware that his attempts to threaten and coerce plaintiff into complicity with defendants' unlawful scheme to otherwise silence plaintiff were futile, defendant CHIEF MICHAEL MARINO impatiently stated in sum and substance: "ALL RIGHT, JUST TAKE HIM, I CAN'T FUCKING STAND HIM ANYMORE" and commanded that the police officers present at the location to forcibly take plaintiff into custody.

156. At all relevant times on October 31, 2009, defendant CHIEF GERALD NELSON was aware of defendant MARINO's actions and in fact, expressly authorized defendant MARINO to unlawfully enter plaintiff's residence, remove plaintiff against his will, and involuntarily confine plaintiff in a psychiatric ward.

Plaintiff Is Violently Attacked and Forcibly Removed From His Own Home against His Will

157. Immediately thereafter, several defendant police officers, including defendants LT. JOSEPH GOFF, SGT. KURT DUNCAN, and LT. CHRISTOPHER BROSCART, pulled plaintiff out of his bed, physically assaulted him, tore his clothes as they threw him to the floor, illegally strip-searched him and violently handcuffed him with his arms behind his back, causing excruciating pain to his wrists, shoulders, arms, neck and back.

158. With plaintiff bound on the floor, alluding to the option plaintiff had been given of ignoring corruption and illegality, defendant CHIEF MARINO walked over to him and with his boot on plaintiff's face, stated: "IT DIDN'T HAVE TO BE LIKE THIS."

159. Defendant CHIEF MARINO then sat on plaintiff's bed as his officers, following his commands, illegally searched plaintiff's body and recovered a digital recorder that plaintiff was holding. Afraid of what plaintiff might have recorded during this incident, defendant CHIEF MARINO illegally seized the recorder himself, stating contemptuously that plaintiff was "BEING CUTE" by trying to record the incident.